

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2009-2010 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2004.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: (per district designation)
- | | |
|----------|-----------------------------------|
| 4 | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
| 1 | Middle/Junior high schools |
| 1 | High schools |
| 0 | K-12 schools |
| 6 | TOTAL |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 15562

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- ☐ Urban or large central city
☒ Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
☐ Suburban
☐ Small city or town in a rural area
☐ Rural

4. 11 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK			0	6			0
K			0	7			0
1			0	8			0
2			0	9			0
3	48	51	99	10			0
4	64	45	109	11			0
5	55	54	109	12			0
			TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL				317

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

<u>1</u>	% American Indian or Alaska Native
<u>4</u>	% Asian
<u>18</u>	% Black or African American
<u>42</u>	% Hispanic or Latino
<u>0</u>	% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
<u>34</u>	% White
<u>1</u>	% Two or more races
<u>100</u>	% Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 6 %

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	16
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	4
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	20
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	318
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.063
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	6.289

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 17 %

Total number limited English proficient 55

Number of languages represented: 1

Specify languages:

Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 58 %

Total number students who qualify: 185

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 14 %

Total Number of Students Served: 44

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u> </u> Autism	<u> </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u>7</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>21</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>12</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> </u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>4</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u> </u> Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
Support staff	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Total number	<u>23</u>	<u>21</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 22 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Daily student attendance	95%	96%	95%	96%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	97%	97%	97%	97%	96%
Teacher turnover rate	4%	4%	17%	9%	0%
Student dropout rate	%	%	%	%	%

Please provide all explanations below.

Please note: Beginning with the 2005 -2006 school year, Landing School included grades 3 ,4 and 5. This resulted in additional staffing needed to teach grade 5 students. Additionally, for the 2006-2007 school year, there was a teacher retirement and maternity leave filled.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

Graduating class size	_____	%
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____	%
Enrolled in a community college	_____	%
Enrolled in vocational training	_____	%
Found employment	_____	%
Military service	_____	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	_____	%
Unknown	_____	%
Total	_____	%

PART III - SUMMARY

Landing Elementary School, or “the Friendly School” as it is known throughout the community of Glen Cove, is a special place for so many reasons. In his eleven years as building principal, Dr. Michael Israel has created a place where students not only receive an education of the highest caliber, but they are also recognized and celebrated for those qualities that make them unique and special individuals.

Glen Cove School District, located on the North Shore of Long Island, is a culturally rich and diverse community. It is a community that Dr. Israel knows well. His family has called Glen Cove “home” for the past 53 years. As a child, Dr. Israel, along with his three brothers, attended Landing School as students. In 1999, Dr. Israel was appointed as principal of the school where he recalls many happy childhood memories. His fondness for the school and his genuine love of children is clearly evident, and he is proud to serve as the head of his “school family”.

In April 2008, Dr. Israel, along with many parent and teacher volunteers, celebrated the 75th anniversary of Landing School. This community event celebrated many joyful Landing occasions from the past, and recalled the many accomplishments that have been achieved throughout the years.

Landing School’s vision for excellence is closely aligned with the school district’s mission which states that as an educational institution, we are committed to knowing each child as an individual, and we provide that child with the skills, attitudes, concepts and knowledge needed to be a complete person. Further, we provide strong leadership, a safe environment, clear goals, high expectations and continuous assessment. We share our successes and grow from our experiences. At Landing School, our philosophy is that all students can achieve. We work hard each day to instill in our students a love of learning, the confidence to achieve greatness, and the support necessary to reach their goals.

Some of our many achievements throughout the years include our principal having been recognized by the March of Dimes as a Golden Apple Award recipient for educational leadership in November 2004. In 2005, Landing School was cited by New York State Education Department as a “High Achieving GAP Closing School”. That same year, our school was identified by the State Education Department as a “Most Improved School” with regard to Grade 4 state math scores. Most recently, the Glen Cove School District has been named the 2009 winner of the prestigious Sylvia Chorp Award for District Innovation in Technology. We are duly honored to have been nominated by the State Education Department for the National Blue Ribbon Award for School Excellence.

As you can see, we have much to be proud of! Most importantly, however, is the pride we feel, and celebrate, when our students achieve academically. We have many traditions here at Landing that spotlight students for their hard work, and commitment to excellence. Years ago, Dr. Israel began a program to honor those students who have shown marked academic improvement during the school year. The program is called “Junior Rising Stars”, and is celebrated twice annually. At a Rising Stars ceremony, students who have been selected by their teachers are awarded ribbons and certificates. Dr. Israel also established the “Principal’s Certificate of Achievement”, given to students who demonstrate academic excellence each marking period. Upon their graduation, Landing 5th graders are eligible to win one of a variety of prestigious awards which include the Presidential Gold and Silver Awards for Academic Excellence and Achievement, The “Triple C” Award which is sponsored by New York State’s Attorney General, and the State Comptroller Award, given to one student annually who demonstrates not only academic excellence, but leadership qualities as well.

For these reasons, and so many more, we believe that Landing School has proven to be the kind of school that could serve as a model of excellence for other elementary schools. We are proud of our many accomplishments, and we look forward to continuing to provide our students with the kind of quality education that sets us apart from other schools.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Landing School is a public elementary school which services students in grades three through five. Our school participates in the New York State Assessment System, and reports its scores based on state performance levels. These levels are briefly explained as follows:

Level 1 – Not Meeting the Standards

Level 2 – Not Fully Meeting the Standards

Level 3 – Meeting the Standards (Proficient)

Level 4 – Meeting the Standards with Distinction (Mastery)

Students who achieve levels 1 and 2 have not met state standards, and therefore, are considered to have “failed” the state assessment. Students who achieve levels 3 and 4 have met or exceeded state standards, and have “passed” the state assessment. More information regarding state performance levels and other related information can be found on the New York State Department of Education website at: <http://www.nysed.gov/>

To better understand Landing School assessment results, information has been collected and collated spanning a period of time through and including 2004 – 2009. In reviewing the statistical tables we prepared for our Blue Ribbon application, there are a number of conclusions that can be drawn from the data collected. We will share our conclusions in the following three categories:

I. Data Relating to the Landing School Student Population:

Over the past 5 academic school years, our student enrollment has ranged between 301- 323, with an average yearly population of 313. Over the past five years, the percent of socio-economic / disadvantaged students has increased steadily from 48% in 2005-2006 to 56% in 2008-2009. Of the socio-economic / disadvantaged population, the largest subgroup for each year cited has been Hispanic. This Hispanic subgroup population has also increased steadily each year from 36% of our total school population in 2005-2006 to 43% in 2008-2009.

II. Trends in Math Assessment Scores Over the Past 5 Years:

Landing School is particularly proud of its achievements in math over the past five years. Generally, our scores have improved with consistency since 2005 throughout all of our grade levels. In Grade 3, the percent of students in our general population who achieved assessment scores of “3” (proficient) and “4” (mastery) increased from 68% in 2005-2006 to 96% in 2008-2009. Students in grade three who achieved mastery level scores increased from 17% to 31% in this same span of time. Among our socio-economic / disadvantaged population in grade 3, students who achieved levels “3” and “4” combined increased from 50% in 2005 – 2006 to 95% in 2008-2009. Grade 4 general population students who earned “3” and “4” increased from 80% in 2006 to 93% in 2009. Students who achieved mastery levels increased from 23% in 2006 to 41% in 2009. Socio-economic / disadvantaged students in Grade 4 who earned “3” or “4” increased from 73% to 90%. Those in this category who achieved mastery level increased from 15% to 34%. Our Grade five students in both the general population and socio-economic / disadvantaged have shown the most marked improvement overall, with general population students earning “3” or “4” increasing from 69% to 95% in four years, and those achieving mastery level increasing from 17% to 39% in this same time span. Among our socio-economic /disadvantaged population, those earning “3” or “4” increased from 60% in 2006 to 91% in 2009. Those in this category who achieved mastery level increased from 11% in 2006 to 39% in 2009.

III. Trends in ELA Assessment Scores Over the Past 5 Years:

Over the past 5 years, each of our three grade levels have made significant gains in the area of English language arts, however these gains must be considered “over time”, rather than increases in evidence year by year. This is due to two main factors. First, the New York State English Language Arts assessment is designed to test proficiency in the components of English language, specifically reading and writing, therefore fluctuations in language proficiency among our ELL learners often causes fluctuations in scores year to year. Secondly, the adoption of a new reading and writing program yielded a diminishing score effect among our third grade population in 2007-2008, since these students were new to our school, and new to our ELA program. Subsequent yearly scores for this grade 3 group show marked improvement as students became better acquainted with Reader’s and Writer’s Workshop strategies and expectations. Overall, Grade 3 general population students improved scores in the proficient / mastery level by increasing from 60% in 2006 to 82% in 2009. Socio-economic / disadvantaged Grade 3 students increased scores in proficiency / mastery from 41% to 73% in this same time period. Grade 4 general population students improved scores in the proficient / mastery level by increasing from 80% in 2006 to 85% in 2009. Socio-economic / disadvantaged Grade 4 students increased scores in proficiency / mastery from 64% to 80% in this same time period. Grade 5 general population students improved scores in the proficient / mastery level by increasing from 80% in 2006 to 93% in 2009. Socio-economic / disadvantaged Grade 5 students increased scores in proficiency / mastery from 72% to 89% in this same time period.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Through the years, assessment data has proven to be a significant factor in targeting the specific learning needs of our students at Landing School. Assessment information gleaned from the New York State Department of Education as well as the data provided to us through the Nassau BOCES data warehouse has been a vital component in our endeavors to raise our overall academic scores and improve our curricular programs.

State assessment scores are often considered and play a major role in determining a student’s eligibility for inclusion in supportive services provided by our school district. When a student is brought up for discussion at an Instructional Support Team (IST) meeting, scores can be referenced to determine if that particular student’s needs would be best met through intervention programs, such as AIS (Academic Intervention Service), or by a more intensive needs programs, such as resource room, or a self-contained class setting. Our school psychologist will refer to state assessment scores in preparing psychological reports for students in which cognitive data is collected and evaluated for recommendation into supportive service programs. State assessment scores are utilized to determine students eligible for the Reading Empowerment and Development (R.E.A.D) program in grade four, as well as students eligible for inclusion in the AIS program, available to grade 5 students in both math and reading.

In terms of professional development, state assessment scores and corresponding data have been considered in determining the kinds of programs and / or consultants that have been brought to our district to help teachers understand and apply alternative strategies with regard to pedagogy. For example, in an effort to increase our overall assessment scores in English Language Arts, all classroom and ancillary teachers have received three years of professional development in Columbia University’s Reader’s and Writer’s Workshops. Staff meetings are periodically dedicated to reviewing pertinent information provided to us by Nassau BOCES data warehouse. Item analysis, GAP and WRAP reports enable teachers to better understand students’ academic strengths and weaknesses, and provide the framework for anticipated academic improvement.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

At Landing School, we pride ourselves in understanding that families and community involvement play an integral part in the success of every child, and that these “stakeholders” have the right to be informed about

assessment results, the meaning of such results, and the importance of their roles in impacting these outcomes. To this end, we actively encourage our families and community at large to stay informed by providing quality information regarding our achievement through regular newsletters, websites, newspaper columns, and various meetings with PTA groups and other community based organizations.

For the past three years, the Teacher Interface has been offered as a resource to teachers through the Nassau BOCES Instructional Data Warehouse (IDW). The Teacher Interface gives teachers the ability to log in and see how their current students in grades 4 through 9 performed on last year's 3 through 8 state assessments. In addition, grades 3 through 8 teachers will now also be able to see how their current students performed on this school year's 3 through 8 assessments.

Each year in November, the Landing School On-Site Committee, comprised of the building principal, teacher and parent volunteers, organizes an evening seminar to better acquaint parents with state assessments in both reading and math for grades three through five. At this seminar, parents are provided specific information which includes testing dates, make-up testing information, and availability of testing data once scoring is complete. Following the informational seminar, parents then break into smaller groups, and are given the chance to experience actual assessment related activities as instructed by teacher volunteers.

Once we have officially received our individual and collective student scores from the State Department of Education, much is done to disseminate this valuable information throughout the community. Grade level scores are immediately posted on our district website. Scores are shared, discussed and explained at Board of Education meetings. Individual student performance data is photocopied and sent to each student's parents. Where applicable, scores are reviewed by teachers at parent / teacher conferences, held twice annually. High and Top Scorers are traditionally photographed and referenced each year in our local newspapers and school newsletters to memorialize top student achievement. Assessment data is also used to determine award recipients at each year's graduation ceremony.

4. Sharing Success:

At Landing School, we understand that education is a field that is constantly evolving, and that this evolution is inevitable as we strive daily to meet the growing and varied needs of all learners. Given the diversity of our student population, ethnic / racial and economic, our school district faces an even greater challenge in providing an instructional program which meets the needs of all and brings about academic progress and positive outcomes for each student individually.

As we determine programs, strategies and techniques that have resulted in positive, measureable outcomes, we also feel an obligation to share our successes with other school districts so that they may reap similar benefits. There are a variety of means by which we share our successes.

On an administrative level, the building principal often attends conferences, seminars, and "collegial circles" which have been designed and devoted to the sharing of ideas and reflections regarding programs that have proven to be effective in improving instructional programs and subsequently raising assessment scores.

Additionally, we are fortunate to have an award winning, state of the art technology department within our district that has greatly enhanced our ability to share programs in which we are involved and have met with great success. The Glen Cove School District website has been pivotal in allowing us to share information about our successes with the broad scope audience provided by the Internet. Our district curriculum committees create all curricular projects on their computers, including lesson and unit plans, using Curricuplan, an Internet based warehouse where teachers can post and share their work with other educators. Individual school websites and teacher "e-board" webpages help to communicate achievements to a more specific audience, namely our extended "class families". Teachers have also made use of sharing ideas electronically with schools in other districts, near and far, through interactive sharing communities such as "Moodle" and "wiki pages".

Last year, Landing fifth graders researched, wrote and published a book about the dangers that face our environment. The book was made available to the general public and sold commercially through Amazon.com. This year, our fifth graders worked collaboratively with the Connolly School fifth graders to publish a book about immigration. If selected to receive the Blue Ribbon Award, we would continue our efforts to share with others the quality educational practices that have led us to achieve our academic goals.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

At Landing School, we continuously strive to improve student achievement by creating a culture of learning where academics come first. Student achievement is usually measured by grades and assessment results. Student achievement is always linked to excellent instruction and a challenging curriculum. Outstanding institutions of learning possess a pervasive culture of learning, where every member of the school community knows that learning comes first. Our foundation for a culture of learning rests upon five pillars:

- a.) An inquiry-based approach to teaching which stimulates student thinking;
- b.) A systematic approach of “Teaching for Student Understanding;”**
- c.) A classroom curriculum design based upon the philosophy of “Understanding by Design”
- d.) An instructional program designed so that all students can learn and achieve based upon differentiation of instruction.
- e.) An instructional program based on the fundamental principles of SEL (social emotional learning)

Our core curriculum is based foundationally on New York State learning standards and performance indicators. Curriculum committees are convened each summer so that teachers are continually engaged in revising subject area curricula to align with changes in state standards. Using Curricuplan, an Internet based program designed for teachers to create and share unit and lesson plans, our teachers make appropriate revisions and update scopes and sequences in various subject areas to serve as guidelines for grade level instruction. Curriculum outlines are shared each year at our annual “Open House for Parents” so that parents are aware of curricular goals for their children each school year.

English Language Arts is taught through a balanced literacy approach with teachers engaging students in active reading and writing through the fundamentals of Reader’s and Writer’s Workshop. Students’ individual reading levels are determined through Fountas & Pinnell assessments administered in the fall and spring of each academic year. Depending on each child’s determined reading level, steps are taken to ensure that each child receives supplemental services where applicable. These services may include resource, AIS and speech and language services, etc. To encourage and nurture higher level thinking skills, students are often engaged in thoughtful literary discussions via Socratic Seminars.

Math is taught utilizing a constructivist methodology where students learn mathematical concepts through discovery. In math instruction, teachers engage students in active rather than passive learning activities. Teachers administer benchmark exams in grades three through five at two month increments, totaling five benchmarks each academic year. Utilizing Edusoft data software, benchmarks are scored electronically and reports are generated immediately so that teachers can track their students’ individual progress as well as content that may need to be revisited and further enriched. Benchmark data is collected and recorded electronically, and shared with each child’s subsequent teachers as he / she proceeds through the grade levels. Technology, specifically through the use of Smartboards, has allowed students to be more interactively involved with regard to math instruction. All of our grade level and ancillary faculty has received training in “Easi-teach”, a technology program that engages teachers in creating and accessing lessons for Smartboard use.

Science and Social Studies curriculum at all grade levels is largely based on hands-on experiential activities as well as project based learning. In science, students are engaged in experiments that explore and apply the fundamentals of the Scientific Method, and science process skills. Curricular goals are centered around the broad topics of life, earth, physical and health sciences. Students are actively involved in higher level thinking tasks and problem solving situations. Social studies curricular goals and activities are aimed at helping students to better understand the world around them, its history, present state, and most importantly, the profound role each one of them plays in its future.

In the area of visual / performing arts, our elementary program has expanded to include many new and exciting opportunities for students in recent years. Presently, our program includes general music classes, chorus, band lessons, and a strings program, taught before school. Each of these departments participate in concerts held in our school twice annually. Our general education music program also affords training and participation of select students in the NYSSMA program. Our school librarian works in concert with the C.W. Post Tilles Center Program for Fine Arts. This program, offered to Landing School fifth graders, engages them in units of study focused on theatre and the performing arts. Our art program allows students of all grades to explore a variety of media, including texture, shape, color and design. Students often participate in local community and state wide art competitions. In addition to the art and music curriculum provided by our teachers, our school PTA has supported our instructional program by funding a wide assortment of performances in the areas of visual and performing arts. Many of these cultural arts programs have been selected not only to educate our students, but to celebrate the diversity that is the fabric of our school community.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

(This question is for elementary schools only)

In previous years, our reading program was limited to basal textbooks with little connection to the writing process. As our scores declined, it had become evident that a “reading program overhaul” was imminent. District literacy committees were formed and set about to research the current trends in reading pedagogy, specifically to identify those programs that brought forth the best outcomes. Three years ago, the district focused its attention on a balanced literacy approach based on the foundational philosophies of Columbia University’s Reader’s and Writer’s Workshop. To this end, all classroom and ancillary teachers received three years of professional development in both components of the program, with additional support provided by literacy coaches at the elementary level. This reading program also included the use of Fountas & Pinnell assessment strategies to determine students’ independent and instructional reading levels. This enabled teachers to more definitively evaluate individual student strengths and weaknesses, while directing them to those resources that would enable students to achieve at their own level. Funds were allotted to supply all classroom and ancillary teachers with a leveled class library. To further support the writing component, teachers received training in “Word Study”.

Struggling readers were also afforded reading support through a variety of programs that aligned with their very specific and individual learning needs. For students who performed significantly below grade level, strategies needed to be determined and developed for appropriate remediation. These students found great success in resource room settings where teachers employed the strategies of the Wilson Program, Orton-Gillingham Program, and Strategic Instructional Model (SIM). Both the Wilson and Orton Gillingham programs were developed with the understanding that reading mastery begins with phonemic awareness and a foundational understanding of phonics and phonetic principles. The SIM program, centered around sentence and paragraph writing, provides a structured technique which all students can use and expand upon for success. Utilizing these programs, students are consistently taught using approaches that benefit multi-modalities, and these approaches are often applied to general education populations with similar success rates. Utilizing the Consultant Teacher model of instruction, struggling readers could receive additional support in decoding, spelling and reading comprehension while remaining in their general education classrooms.

By employing an eclectic approach, and utilizing the best comprehensive programs available to students, Landing School teachers have been able to dramatically improve assessment scores in reading, and give students the tools they need to be successful lifelong learners.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

A significant part of our Landing School Mission centers around our commitment to know each child as an individual, and provide that child with the skills, attitudes, concepts and knowledge needed to be a complete person, and lifelong learner. At Landing, we also feel a responsibility to prepare our students for the future of technology.

In an ever changing technological world, it has become vital to each students' success to expose them to the latest technological hardware and software, provide instruction, and afford them a variety of opportunities to practice, apply and improve their skills in this area. In recognition of our efforts to keep our finger on the pulse of the technological revolution and make available new and exciting resources to our students, the Glen Cove School District was recently awarded the prestigious Sylvia Chorp Award for District Innovation in Technology. This award comes from ISTE, the largest and most influential professional technology educators' organization in the world.

At Landing School, you will find a large assortment of computers in each classroom, as well as sets of mobile laptops and a computer lab. In the past year, our school library has been transformed into a state of the art Library Media Center. Each school in the district has an assortment of digital cameras and video recorders. Most of the classrooms at Landing School are equipped with Smartboards to encourage and support interactive learning opportunities. One of our Landing School teachers has created and maintains a "Media Club" after school. It is not uncommon for our students to visit the District's Media Center, located in our High School, in order to create projects employing a large variety of media modalities. Many students and teachers at Landing School also communicate with others school electronically via such programs as "Moodle" and Internet "Wiki Pages". We are very proud of our advances in the field of technology, and believe strongly in the enrichment it provides our students.

4. Instructional Methods:

Given the diversity of our student population, ethnic / racial and economic, our school is faced with the arduous challenge of providing an instructional program which meets the needs of all of our students and brings about success for each one individually. Our academic successes can be attributed to our dedication and understanding that differentiating instruction is essential in helping each student to achieve his / her personal academic goals.

Through the use of various formal assessments, we have been able to identify those students whose needs can only be met through the additional supportive programs that we provide. These programs include, but are not limited to, resource room, READ (Reading Empowerment and Development), AIS (Academic Intervention Services) ELL (English Language Learners) and Speech and Language.

Within the classroom setting, students' individual needs are often met when they are formed into subgroups based on skill level, such as Guided Reading Groups. Resource Room and AIS teachers will "push-in" to classrooms to assist students based on their individual needs, while enabling the students to be included in their regular classroom instruction. Recognizing that students learn via a variety of learning modalities, teachers vary their lessons to include components that benefit visual, auditory, concrete operational, and constructivist learners.

Since Landing School has a large population of English Language Learners, our ELL teacher focuses a great deal of attention on differentiating her instruction. For example, students in her program are provided texts on

their individual reading levels. When teaching content areas, she gathers resources that she knows her students will be able to read and comprehend. Within each unit, she will have students read utilizing text that supports the topic and is appropriate to the child's reading level. For emergent English language learners, she begins by developing survival and oral language skills through the use of a personal dictionary. She adapts the content by utilizing techniques such as "See-Think-Wonder" to build background knowledge. Use of visuals, graphic organizers and manipulatives further helps her to differentiate instruction for her emergent readers.

Differentiation of instruction has been a hallmark of our academic success, and we continue to seek out and apply new methodologies to further support our students' achievements.

5. Professional Development:

In recent years, much greater attention has been given to providing professional development for teachers within the Glen Cove School District in response to what had been substandard scores on state assessments in English Language Arts and Math.

Dr. Shari Camhi, District Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction and Technology, offers after-school workshops for teachers in their first, second and third years of teaching. Each group receives individualized workshops and seminars once monthly throughout the school year.

In addition to the training teachers receive "after school hours" during faculty meetings, professional development has also been offered during the school day. In this way, many of the techniques and strategies that our consultants share with our teachers can now be modeled in classrooms for teachers to observe, and better understand. Utilizing coaches has also made it possible for teachers to apply these new strategies under the guidance of professionals who would later meet with them to discuss their observations, make recommendations, and avail themselves to answer questions and address concerns.

In the past five years, we have seen dramatic increases in our scores due in part to the adoption of the Readers and Writers Workshop approach to English Language Arts instruction, as well as the constructivist approach to teaching mathematics, as presented by our district math consultant. Many of the topics discussed in professional development seminars are closely aligned with specific standards in ELA and math. Teachers have received training that will enhance the way their students organize their thoughts, and express them in written form. Many of the skill areas that comprise Reader's Workshop are assessed on state assessments in grades three through five, and therefore the skill building that takes place in the classroom setting via this program enables students to score optimally on their state exams. Some of these skill areas include word study, reading for meaning, understanding beyond the text, "text to self" connections, etc. An integral part of the state assessments in math require students to be able to show their work, and more importantly, explain how they arrived at their answers. Using the constructivist approach to math, as students engage in activities that allow them to "discover" mathematics, they are better equipped to respond in writing to questions that require explanation. Professional development has also been made available for teachers of students with more specific needs. Ancillary staff who are responsible for teaching our special needs students have received professional development in reading, specifically the Wilson and Orton Gillingham programs, as well as SIM training.

Teachers have also received extensive training in the area of technology. Most Landing School teachers are proficient in the use of a SmartBoard and have received supplemental training in "Easi-Teach", a software program that allows teachers to create on SmartBoards, as well as access lessons for SmartBoard use.

6. School Leadership:

Our academic successes would not have been possible without the strong leadership provided at both the building and District levels. Our building principal, Dr. Michael Israel, works closely with Dr. Shari Camhi, District Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology.

Dr. Camhi visits Landing School each week to discuss programs, initiatives, and curricular needs so that we can continue to offer our students a quality education. She has also been able to apply for, and been awarded, a number of grants through the years that have made many of our programs possible.

Dr. Laurence Aronstein, Superintendent of Schools, also visits Landing School periodically to address any concerns the principal or staff may have. The support we receive from district central office helps to create a positive atmosphere where ideas can be shared, and changes made in the best interest of our students.

At the building level, our school principal continues to focus on improving academic achievement. His responsibilities are many, however he prides himself on hard work, setting high expectations for staff and students, and helping all to achieve their goals. It is his job to plan in-service presentations for his staff that provide them with the tools and knowledge needed to make a difference in a child's life. The building principal supports, evaluates and enhances teachers' professional growth and development by collaborating with them to establish individual goals and monitors their performance through formal and informal observations. In doing so, he oversees the ability of our teachers to employ new strategies, and engage in thoughtful, constructive discussion following each observation. In an effort to promote and maintain positive relations with parents and the community, the building principal serves as a member of the Landing School "On-Site" Committee, which meets monthly to discuss school policy and programs and to propose changes where applicable. This committee also reports annually to the Board of Education. On a personal level, he continues to advance his own professional development by attending conferences and joining professional collegial organizations. Most importantly, he is the leader of our "Landing School Family", the one who creates and maintains our vision of excellence.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: NYS Mathematics Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	71	94	68	
% Advanced	31	20	33	17	
Number of students tested	110	111	87	104	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	88	89	50	
% Advanced	17	11	27	9	
Number of students tested	59	66	45	54	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	95	63		
% Advanced	7	11	0		
Number of students tested	15	19	8	17	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	84	94	47	
% Advanced	21	7	21	8	
Number of students tested	53	43	33	36	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	100	100	100	
% Advanced	11	0	8	38	
Number of students tested	9	9	12	8	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	80	89	25	
% Advanced	5	0	22	0	
Number of students tested	22	20	9	20	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 3 Test: NYS ELA Test
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	66	86	60	
% Advanced	10	9	15	5	
Number of students tested	106	110	87	97	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	57	82	41	
% Advanced	4	9	7	2	
Number of students tested	55	66	44	49	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	69	75		
% Advanced	8	11	0		
Number of students tested	13	19	8	17	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	49	78	34	
% Advanced	4	7	6	0	
Number of students tested	51	43	32	29	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	43	75	50	
% Advanced	0	0	8	0	
Number of students tested	8	7	12	6	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	32	100	0	
% Advanced	0	0	17	0	
Number of students tested	20	19	6	12	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4

Test: NYS Mathematics Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	89	85	80	94
% Advanced	41	41	36	23	42
Number of students tested	112	95	101	109	110
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	87	75	73	90
% Advanced	34	35	19	15	34
Number of students tested	68	46	48	48	50
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	50	65	75	
% Advanced	37	10	12	19	
Number of students tested	19	10	17	16	12
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	90	84	65	91
% Advanced	30	31	22	9	33
Number of students tested	46	39	37	34	45
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	81	80	50	89
% Advanced	0	0	10	0	0
Number of students tested	12	16	10	16	19
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	70	80	50	86
% Advanced	5	10	7	0	14
Number of students tested	20	10	15	12	14
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Standards for elementary and middle level English language arts and mathematics assessments administered in 1999 through 2005 are different from those for the 2006 assessments. As such, valid comparisons between 2006 data and data from previous years cannot be made.

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 4 Test: NYS ELA Test
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Feb
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	85	78	80	81
% Advanced	6	11	12	7	20
Number of students tested	110	91	100	106	96
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	73	64	64	78
% Advanced	1	4	2	7	14
Number of students tested	67	45	47	45	37
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	67	53	69	
% Advanced	0	0	0	6	
Number of students tested	20	9	17	16	12
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	73	72	61	77
% Advanced	0	5	6	6	13
Number of students tested	44	38	36	31	30
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	67	78	56	67
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	10	15	9	16	18
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	44	57	64	67	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	18	7	14	9	0
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Standards for elementary and middle level English language arts and mathematics assessments administered in 1999 through 2005 are different from those for the 2006 assessments. As such, valid comparisons between 2006 data and data from previous years cannot be made.

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 5 Test: NYS Mathematics Test
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	96	85	69	
% Advanced	39	41	27	17	
Number of students tested	101	104	113	108	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	94	78	60	
% Advanced	24	31	24	11	
Number of students tested	55	49	50	53	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	89	80		
% Advanced	22	22	25		
Number of students tested	18	18	20	13	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	95	69	60	
% Advanced	33	33	17	9	
Number of students tested	39	39	36	45	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	83	56	39	
% Advanced	0	25	0	0	
Number of students tested	22	12	18	18	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63	82	50	30	
% Advanced	0	0	17	0	
Number of students tested	8	11	6	10	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 5 Test: NYS ELA Test
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	94	81	80	
% Advanced	17	11	14	16	
Number of students tested	101	103	107	106	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	87	70	72	
% Advanced	9	2	7	10	
Number of students tested	55	48	46	50	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	84	67		
% Advanced	12	0	6		
Number of students tested	17	19	18	13	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	89	67	73	
% Advanced	15	0	0	11	
Number of students tested	39	37	34	44	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	85	47	61	
% Advanced	0	0	5	6	
Number of students tested	22	13	19	18	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	50		86	
% Advanced	0	0		0	
Number of students tested	8	8	3	7	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes: